UPCOMING RFA MEETING
SEPTEMBER 20, 2019

ACETAMINOPHEN
BEYOND FEVER, PAIN & HEPATOTOXICITY

Gary Merrill, PhD
Professor: Cell Biology & Neuroscience
Rutgers University

Where: Dean’s Conference Room, Piscataway
Date: September 20, 2019, Noon

All retired and current, faculty, staff, and students are welcome to attend.

Lunch is available for a $10 contribution at the meeting. Attendees who have not obtained retiree parking privileges, NOW NEED TO REGISTER online to park for this event.

Gary Merrill, PhD

Dr. Gary Merrill is professor of cell biology and neuroscience in the Rutgers University Division of Life Sciences with an office in Nelson Labs, Busch Campus. He is a physiologist with emphasis on cardiovascular physiology and has been at Rutgers since 1976. His books include Our Marvelous Bodies (Rutgers, 2008), Our Aging Bodies (Rutgers 2015), and Our Intelligent Bodies (Rutgers 2020). Web site: https://cbn.rutgers.edu/cb-profile/gfm

UPDATE: Woody's Cafeteria reopened in mid-September and offers a variety of food options for our faculty, staff and students. Hours will be 8 a.m. through 6 p.m., Monday through Friday, throughout the academic year.
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I thank David Seiden, Paul Manowitz, Eckhard Kemmann and Gordon Schochet for editing/proof-reading and Marie Kleeman for production. Ruthe Geardino provides valuable assistance throughout the year in support of the RFA and its quarterly meetings.

RFA Seminar June 14, 2019
Professor GERALD POMPER, PhD

Dr. Gerald Pomper is Board of Governors Professor Emeritus of Political Science at the Eagleton Institute of Politics of Rutgers University. A specialist in the American elections and politics, he has authored or edited 21 books including Passions and Interests, Elections in America, Voters’ Choice, and Ordinary Heroes and American Democracy, a Pulitzer Prize nominee. Educated at Columbia and Princeton, he has taught abroad at Tel-Aviv, Oxford and Australian National Universities. Prior to ‘retiring’ he chaired political science departments of the University and Livingston College. Website:https://www.polisci.rutgers.edu/cb-profile/gpomper

Gordon Schochet, chair of the RFA Program Committee, began his introduction by extending thanks to Ruthe Geardino for her critical role in supporting the RFA. He introduced Dr. Pomper, his long-time colleague in political science, recounting Dr. Pomper’s extensive involvement as a scholar of presidential politics and elections.

ON THE ROAD TO AND FROM THE ELECTION OF 2020
Summary of talk by Michael Gochfeld
Corrected by Dr. Pomper

Dr. Pomper indicated that “in this presentation I seek both to analyze the outcome of the 2018 election and to speculate on likely implications for the critical 2020 presidential election.”

The 2018 Congressional Election
“The 2018 election represented the largest shift in the House of Representatives in a century. It reflected a major victory for the democrats, winning 41 seats, a record 8.5% shift for a party going from minority to majority.”
“It is apparent that the electorate considered 2018 a very important election, compared with other midterm elections. This is reflected in the astonishingly high turnout for a mid-term election (see Table 1). In 2018, 118 million voted, 50% of eligible voters, and in 30 states there were more than 50% voter turnout, compared to only seven states in the 2014 mid-term.”

Table 1. Turnout in recent U.S. Elections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total turnout (millions)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnout % of eligible voter</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># states &gt; 50% turnout</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High/low turnout</td>
<td>59/29%</td>
<td>75/50%</td>
<td>64/39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic gain/loss vs. Republicans</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>+8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This democratic victory in the House will have an impact on the president’s legislative agenda, but there is still a lot a president can do outside of Congress. There are things we didn’t even expect a president would attempt—legally or not—for example, on Trump’s anti-regulatory, anti-climate and anti-abortion rights agenda.

Demographically, the democratic victory was across the board with gains both in suburbs (4%) and rural areas (7%), among women (8%) (both college and non-college), and gains among the white working class (5%). Still only 34% of whites without college education supported democrats. Whereas Clinton’s election was hindered by the >7% third party vote, this minority was only 2% in 2018.

Democrats did better in mobilizing the vote of African-Americans, in contrast to 2016. Hillary did not effectively get out the black vote, and it is possible that a black vice president candidate would have mobilized enough votes to switch the three critical states (PA, MI, WI) that Trump narrowly won.

The congressional election was a party-determined vote. One of the major trends over the past 50 years has been the strengthening of voting along straight party lines. In the 1960s the same party correlation between the presidential and House vote across districts was 0.6. It is now 0.97—many more straight party line votes and far fewer split tickets.

The 2018 vote clearly reflected negative attitudes towards Trump, mobilized by the rapid emergence and growth of a large variety of groups to counter his rise to power. One of the prominent groups—of which I am a member—Indivisible, was created after the election of Trump. In less than two years, this group had engendered 3,800 local affiliates and sent 12,000 canvassers into the field, and claimed a national total of 12 million voter contacts. These were effective in getting out the astonishing vote for a mid-term election.

Activist groups such as Indivisible and the opposition to Trump generally represent a new kind of activism, mobilizing people who had not previously been politically engaged. Theda Skocpol has reported that the new activists in this social movement tend to be women, in mid-size cities, middle aged, middle income with the “retired librarian” as an archetype.

Some commentators emphasize progressive, even radical, aspects of the 2018 democrat victory, but among the usually republican districts that elected a democrat, the victors were moderates, not progressives, reflecting the underlying leanings of their district. For example, in the nearby NJ 7th district, moderate democrat Tom Malinowski beat moderate republican Leonard Lance, by a 5% margin. Progressives may have won in traditionally Democrat and liberal districts, but it was the Malinowski’s that won in most of the flipped districts. It was a movement against Trump and more a movement of moderates than an uprising of radicals and definitely not an
endorsement of Bernie Sanders’ “democratic socialism.”

The 2020 Election
The major political parties have changed many of their past appeals. Today democrats are in favor of intervention in the Middle East to protect minorities in Syria and protect the Kurds. A generation ago, who would have thought that the democrats would be defending the FBI and the CIA? The left is now the party of free trade whereas Trump has made republicans the party of tariffs. Now the democrats are arrayed against the Russians and intervention, whereas historically the left was more likely to favor Russia. The right and Trump have become nationalist rather than internationalist, protectionist rather than free trade, and pro-Russia rather than sternly anti-communist.

There are also changes in the parties’ voting bases. The republicans, or at least the Trump campaign, pre-empted the white working class, traditionally a stronghold for democrats.

More generally, there is increased political polarization in the U.S. between democrats and republicans compared to a generation ago. Partisans have shown greater movement away from the center toward a mostly liberal democratic party facing a mostly conservative republican party.

This change is illustrated in Figure 1, which shows the distribution of positions [consistently liberal vs. consistently conservative] taken by democrats [blue] and republicans [red] with the vertical lines illustrating the median positions - pretty close together in 1994 and far apart in 2014, and still widening. These positions include attitudes on social policies, minority opportunity, income disparities, minimum wage, gender equality and immigration.

Figure 1

Another disquieting trend is the rising tide of partisan antipathy. In 1994, 16% of democrats had “very unfavorable” views of republicans but by 2017 this had risen to 45%, with almost exactly the same percent of republicans having very unfavorable views of democrats, with each thinking that it was “dangerous” to elect the opposing party.

Another indicator is found in The Civic Culture by G.A. Almond and S. Verba, a five-nation survey study among which were questions, “would you mind if your daughter or son married someone of the opposite party?” In the U.S this was not an issue in 1960, but in the last five years the American figure is itself close to 50%.

We are now approaching the presidential nominations for 2020. The first democratic candidate debates are coming up soon. Only eight of the 23 candidates are getting more than 1% of support in opinion polls. The next few months will result in serious winnowing. By March it should be obvious who the democrats’ candidate will be.

There are relatively few policy conflicts among the democratic candidates, and each will have to work to carve out differences that set them apart from the field. As long as they are united that Trump must be defeated, they are free to espouse common themes such as the Green New Deal or Medicare for All or abortion rights, although these can be defined differently by individual candidates.

As the current front-runner, Joe Biden should survive putting a hand on ladies’
shoulders, and most voters won’t remember Anita Hill, who—by the way—said recently that “of course” she would vote for Joe Biden against Trump. The only thing that’s important for most democrats is to defeat Donald Trump. This is going to be the number one item in each democrat’s plank. Policy details, however, may influence the turnout.

Despite media attention to the progressives and the enthusiasm of the group, only 22% of democrats identify as progressive. Biden has the highest rating among the democrats. The left’s argument against running Biden, is that you need the enthusiasm of the left to mobilize the people, but in fact you might get more support if you are not left. The failure of the left is believing that voters in general are ideologues like them, but voters don’t dwell on minute details of policies; voters make general choices rather than focus on detailed policy.

There are strategic differences within the party on which voting blocs to target and how. But politics is a matter of arithmetic. You get more votes by getting out more voters. “Reluctant votes count as much as enthusiastic votes.” Ultimately the crucial determinant in 2020 is only a matter of turnout. Whoever gets their voters out will win. Probably as many as 90% of the voters already know how they are going to vote—for or against Trump. Forget about the campaign. Just get people to the polls.

The outcome? Polls today predict Trump losing to almost every democrat. This is surprising. Despite the burgeoning economy Trump is running overall unfavorable ratings. Considering that we are not in a war and he has not done anything (yet) to get us into a war—it is remarkable that his ratings continue unfavorable.

And polls are usually reliable forecasts. Polls correctly predicted Clinton’s victory by 2-3%, which in fact she did achieve—only the electoral distribution didn’t work for her. Models taking into account economic growth and candidate favorability have been used to predict a very close election taking into account a significant advantage for incumbency (=114 electoral votes).

For example, with economic growth of 3%, Trump should win the electoral vote even with a 20% negative approval. Putting together the different models predicts a very close outcome for the 2020 race.

The outcome will also depend on the issues that come to the fore in the campaign. If the election is fought on the basis of the Affordable Care Act implementation, respondents prefer democrats by a large margin 54% to 30%. If immigration is the lead issue, a small plurality (45% to 42%) think republicans can handle it better.

The fundamental division in 2020 will be the parties’ positions on both economic and social issues. Figure 2 divides people by their economic views on the X axis, with liberal views (redistributive taxation, reduce economic disparities) to the left and conservative (more tax cuts) on the right. Social views are found on the Y axis, with liberal views on racism, immigration, abortion and gay rights) in the bottom quadrants; conservative views in the top quadrants.

The social and economic liberals are in the lower left quadrant while the consistent conservatives are on the upper right. The nearly uniform colors, blue or red in those quadrants, show voting corresponding to voters’ views. The upper left quadrant is the critical group, persons who are both economic liberals and social conservatives, including for example democrats opposed to abortion.

The republicans predominate in this quadrant. So a big issue for the 2020 election is what’s going to happen among these voters. Democrats can lose the election if they insist on having a pure
identity politics (women’s rights, gay rights, racism), above all issues, thereby losing the populist and working-class voters in the upper left quadrant. Does touching a woman on the shoulder (as Biden did) equate to opposing racial and gender equality?

Levitsky and Ziblatt identified four warning signs: 1) weak commitment to democratic rule, 2) denial of the legitimacy of political openness, 3) less toleration of differences and more tolerance of violence and finally 4) readiness to tolerate suppression of the opposition and media.

Where are we, the United States, today?

**CRESNuevo CELEBRATES 25 YEARS OF COLLABORATION WITH DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

By Joanna Burger, PhD
Cell Biology & Neuroscience

Few academic research programs survive more than two decades. On July 30, 2019, the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESNuevo), founded at Rutgers (Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences Institute (EOHSI) celebrated its 25th year of consecutive funding by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), as well as the promise of five more years.

After World War II, the Cold War arms race to build and test ever-larger nuclear weapons was conducted with little regard for the safe and careful disposal of hazardous radioactive and chemical wastes at the giant, secretive industrial facilities where plutonium was produced and H-bombs assembled. The sudden ending of the Cold War ca 1990, shifted the DOE mission from making bombs to cleanup of the Cold War’s nuclear legacy of hazardous materials in the 34 states where facilities had played a role in nuclear weapons production. Cleanup became a national priority, but the DOE and its contractors were bomb builders accustomed to total secrecy and had neither experience nor stomach for cleanup, let alone transparency.

A National Academy of Sciences review panel urged the department to take on an academic partner to provide credibility for
the federal government’s cleanup role, and in 1994 Rutgers formed a consortium with the University of Washington that competed successfully for the single, large cooperative agreement. Bernard Goldstein (RWJMS-EHOSI) served as the PI, Gilbert Ommen (UW) as co-PI and Charles Powers as director. Michael Gochfeld (RWJMS), Joanna Burger (FAS), Michael Greenberg (Bloustein) and David Kosson (Engineering) were involved with Goldstein and Powers on the initial grant and are still the core researchers of CRESP.

Whereas the DOE traditionally ignored the stakeholders around its secretive contaminated sites, CRESP was formed with the concept of stakeholder concerns and interests as central to the research and risk communication mission.

CRESP has evolved over the quarter century, but maintains its central mission of providing objectivity, expertise and research support to the DOE’s environmental management mission adding credibility to its public communications. The grant is now at Vanderbilt University with David Kosson, PhD and alumnus of Rutgers as the PI. Ongoing projects address the risks from different kinds of radioactive and chemical wastes in different places (soil, ground water, buildings) and different rates of movement with potential exposure to neighbors at the fence line, or downwind or downriver. CRESP focused DOE’s attention on the protection of the cleanup workers who work under potentially highly hazardous conditions to decontaminate and demolish the crumbling factory structures.

CRESP now embraces a dozen universities and an equal number of disciplines, and its continued assistance to the DOE has resulted in millions of dollars saved through improved risk evaluations, decision analysis and remediation techniques. The CRESP members from Rutgers (Gochfeld, Greenberg, Burger) have conducted ecological and human health risk assessment and risk communication with stakeholders at Hanford (Washington), INEEL (Idaho), SRS (South Carolina), Oak Ridge (Tennessee) and Amchitka (Alaska), among others. CRESP’s important work has been recognized in a five-year renewal of funding in support of the nuclear cleanup mission. The cleanup task remains huge and hazardous, costing up to $6 billion/year. New technologies are needed for some unique hazards, and the task is now expected to last to the end of the century. Many of the “cleaned up” lands retain high levels of radiation that will keep them off limits for humans for centuries.

Map of DOE sites requiring cleanup.
UNIVERSITY CELEBRATES CENTENNIAL OF PAUL ROBESON GRADUATION

[Assembled by Michael Gochfeld, MD, PhD from Rutgers University websites including https://robeson100.rutgers.edu/about-paul-robeson]

In 2019 Rutgers University celebrates Paul Robeson, one of the University’s most distinguished graduates. In 1915 Robeson (the “e” is silent), became Rutgers’ third African American student. During his time at Rutgers he excelled in athletics, scholarship and the arts.

From the University website: “Robeson, a consensus All-American in 1917 and 1918 and widely regarded as one of the University’s all-time greatest players, will be honored as part of the Rutgers football team’s game against Boston College on Sept. 21,” the university has announced. “Rutgers honors his achievements as a scholar, athlete, actor, singer and global activist in a yearlong celebration featuring lectures, performances, art exhibitions, and more. The dedication of the Paul Robeson Plaza on the College Avenue Campus in spring 2019 will pay tribute to his legacy. Robeson is also recognized by other facilities, such as the Paul Robeson library on the Newark campus.”

This summer Robeson banners adorn the Rutgers campus.

The Rutgers website continues: “Paul Robeson is one of Rutgers University’s most distinguished alumni and the quintessential 20th century Renaissance man. The son of a runaway slave, Robeson attended Rutgers College in New Brunswick on an academic scholarship, becoming the university’s third black student and its first black football player. At Rutgers, ‘Robey’—as he was known at school—showed his prowess on the athletic field as well as in the classroom. An extraordinary athlete, he won 15 varsity letters in football, basketball, baseball and track.”

He was a two-time All-American in football and was belatedly admitted to the College Football Hall of Fame. A story reports that
in 1917, still facing racial abuse on the field, Robeson led Rutgers to a victory over a highly favored, undefeated Naval Reserve team at Ebbetts Field, where 30 years later Jackie Robinson became the first African American in Major League baseball.

“His scholarly accomplishments included being inducted into the Phi Beta Kappa Society and Rutgers' Cap and Skull Honor Society. At Rutgers, Robeson, who spoke many languages fluently, honed his oratory skills as a member of the Intercollegiate Debating Association. Moreover, he was valedictorian of his graduating class in 1919. His valedictory speech exhorted his listeners to champion a society based on character, not color.”

Robeson played in a professional football league while earning a law degree from Columbia Law School but decided to use his artistic talents in theater and music to promote African and African-American history and culture. Over nearly four decades, he achieved worldwide acclaim as a vocalist and actor on stage and screen. Robeson’s operatic accomplishments included the very popular rendition of “Ol Man River” from Porgy and Bess and his recurrent roles in New York and London as Shakespeare’s Othello, the latter the longest running Shakespeare performance—still today.

“A towering figure in the African-American struggle for human dignity and democratic rights, Robeson connected this struggle with people around the world who also were fighting for political rights, cultural recognition and economic justice.”

“The spotlight that shines on Robeson on the centennial of his graduation from Rutgers illuminates the rich legacy he left at the university and the world.”

There was a time, however, when the University was silent about Robeson. In the 1950s, Robeson’s commitment to human rights, his fight against oppression and for racial justice, included publicly praising the Soviet Union, and publicly chastising the House Un-American Affairs Committee as “shameful.” He was widely condemned as a communist, and was blacklisted for his views and internationalism. Despite, or more likely because of, his world recognition as opera singer and actor and activist, he was denied a passport for a decade.

In 1958 Robeson published his autobiography Here I Stand, recounting his upbringing, education and his growing involvement and dedication to social causes around the world.

By the end of the 1950s and especially in the 1960s the public’s views were softened, McCarthyism was fading, and Robeson’s image was resurrected. In 1973 the university bestowed on him a Doctorate of Humane Letters degree. In 1995 he was elected to the College Football Hall of Fame and in 2004 he was honored on a United States commemorative stamp.

The university website has a detailed chronology of Robeson’s life. His Rutgers athletic accomplishments were not without racist assaults, including, at first, from his own teammates. Likewise his stage appearances with white actors at first encountered hostile audiences.

Not captured on the University chronology was the infamous Concert at Peekskill, NY
(1949), where a mob waving racist, antisemitic and anti-communist signs, attacked the audience with bats and rocks and overturned buses. The mob attack had been publicized in advance with slogans such as “Wake Up America”, in an attempt to halt the concert, but neither Robeson nor the audience had been deterred. Historic photos showed the NY State Police enjoying the rock-throwing spectacle, not aiding the victims.

Although Robeson’s operatic and concert accomplishments are fairly well known, his athletic and academic achievements and his globalism are less well known. The Rutgers year-long tribute has included lectures and concerts which have been a rich source of information and inspiration to the community.

Recognition extends beyond the university. For example, New Brunswick has renamed Commercial Avenue as Paul Robeson Boulevard.

[Editor’s note: High among Robeson’s musical repertoire, I personally remember his rendition of the patriotic cantata, Ballad for Americans, as the greatest and most lyrical praise of American values on equality-MG]

**RUTGERS CENTER ON GUN VIOLENCE RESEARCH**

In the June 2019 issue we announced the inauguration on the Rutgers Center. In view of recent events, it seemed reasonable to stay in touch with this initiative.

Michael Ostermann, center co-director, provided the following update and corrections:

“The Center on Gun Violence Research at Rutgers University is currently in the process of building connections with local, state and national partners to secure data that will allow it to objectively explore compelling research questions. Through this process, the center seeks to fulfill its mission of providing high-quality multi-disciplinary research on firearm violence causality and prevention, and to translate its research into clear and actionable policies and programs. This will help to increase the safety and health of environments for NJ residents to live, learn, work and play.”

**Correction:** In the June Issue, Stephanie Bonne, MD, was mis-identified as director of research, whereas Paul Boxer, PhD, is the research director and Dr. Bonne is the center’s director of surveillance.

**EVIDENCE-BASED MEDICINE CAN INFLUENCE PRACTICE**

From *Rutgers Today* (Aug 1, 2019)

While “translational medicine” typically refers to bench-to-bedside applications of basic sciences, it is equally important that epidemiologic evidence translate into clinical practice in a timely manner.

The American Academy of Pediatrics (ca 2008) recommended that “cold medicines” (including decongestants) not be given to young children (<6 yrs old) for “colds”. A recent Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences study by Robert Wood Johnson Medical School faculty member, Daniel Horton, MD, et al, found that pediatricians have gotten that message, and between 2002 and 2015 cold medicine recommendations for young children are down about 50%. However, antihistamine recommendations, also not usually indicated for kids’ colds, are up.

**SAVING NEW JERSEY FROM THE RISING TIDE**

*How Action Driven by Science, Policy, Engineering and Planning Could Future-proof the Garden State.*

While inaction on fossil fuels and sluggish action on renewables is a major focus of Climate Action, others are planning how to survive under water, so to speak. The new
by-word is not “prevention” but “adaptation.”
Sea level rise projections hinge on the magnitude of carbon emission or reduction, and the ‘behavior’ of the Antarctic Ice Sheet. Even optimistic models predict several feet of sea level rise, accompanied by more frequent severe flooding, by 2100.
Dr. Kopp addressed the RFA on the “prevention” side in his March 2019 lecture.

Now, the Rutgers climate web site also addresses “adaptation”
https://impact.rutgers.edu/the-rising-tide/?utm_source=rutgerstoday&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=launch

For example, “Three broad responses to coastal hazards are available to maintain coastal environments in the face of sea-level rise:

1. Relocating development away from the shore;
2. Accommodating natural processes by continuing occupancy and adjusting to the hazard (for example, by building houses on pilings); and
3. Protecting existing infrastructure in place.

“State programs like Blue Acres facilitate relocation and can point to some success stories, but as the Climate Central/Zillow analysis found, houses are being built in exposed areas several times faster than others are being bought out.”

In the last century, “Use of hard shore protection structures such as seawalls, bulkheads and groins to protect infrastructure was common…. Now, beach nourishment is more common, and New Jersey is one of the national leaders in implementing large-scale nourishment programs. The volume of sediment available for nourishment operations in New Jersey is sufficient for now, but availability in the future is uncertain. Replenishing the beach, also known as nourishment, pushes plant and animal habitats toward the sea, where they would normally seek to move toward the land.”

“It is critical that the state and coastal communities develop resilience plans that are robust to the range of possible futures the state might face. We need approaches that are science-based.”

“Rutgers is playing a key role in helping bring such efforts to fruition. And we cannot treat planning for future sea-level rise as independent of efforts to decarbonize the state, national and global economy.”

THE RWJMS CLASS OF 2023
From The Weekly View (Aug 9, 2019)

Donning their new white coats and reciting the Hippocratic Oath in front of a full house at The State Theatre, the 165 members of Robert Wood Johnson Medical School's Class of 2023 marked their entrance into the medical profession as part of the school's annual White Coat Ceremony.

“The Class of 2023 is diverse in culture, as well as in experience, with nearly half the class having pursued another career or advanced education between earning their undergraduate degree and becoming a medical student. Sixteen percent of the class are entering with either master's or doctorate degrees, including four students who are part of the medical school's unique dual-degree program with Rutgers Ernest Mario School of Pharmacy, in which they earned a doctorate in pharmacy before matriculating at Robert Wood Johnson Medical School. Service to the community–locally and globally–and mentorship are also common threads among the class, which includes 46 students who hold bachelor's degrees from Rutgers.”

Other statistics:
49% female
25% born abroad
Only 1/3 entered directly from college
75% Natural Science majors
15% Social Science/Humanities
Robert Wood Johnson Medical School Retired Faculty Association
Global Health Fellowship Fund

The RFA is sponsoring medical students to learn, help and teach in foreign countries, a potentially life-changing experience under the aegis of the Global Health Initiative of Rutgers Robert Wood Johnson Medical School. The RFA is helping to support summer programs or international electives for medical students and is asking you to consider adding your support to this effort. All funds go to help the students without any deduction for administrative expense.

You can submit your donation to support the RFA Global Health Fellowship Fund by sending a check made payable to the “RWJMS Retired Faculty Association” and mailing it to:

Paul Lehrer, PhD, RFA Treasurer
Department of Psychiatry
Rutgers Robert Wood Johnson Medical School
671 Hoes Lane West, Piscataway, NJ 08854.

All contributions are tax deductible as charitable contributions. The RFA is a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization.

-----------------------------------------------------------------

Below is a sample of some of the recent student international projects. Go to the actual articles from http://rwjms.rutgers.edu/global_health/ihig/student_experiences.html.
More than 20 countries are represented.

**Bolivia**
Child Family Health International - La Paz, Bolivia: by Alex Channing

**Costa Rica**
Adventure Education Center Spanish Institute - Costa Rica: by Margarita Sergonis
International Health Central American Institute (IHCAI) - Costa Rica: by Luba Rakhlin
International Health Central American Institute (IHCAI) - Costa Rica: by Rula Kanj
International Health Central American Institute (IHCAI) - Costa Rica: by Jaheedah Raone

**Ecuador**
Cachamsi Medical Spanish Institute - Ecuador: by Abha Gupta
Interhealth South America - Ecuador: by Priya Narayanan
Interhealth South America - Ecuador: by Chana Weiner
Andean Global Studies - Ecuador: by Nathaniel Hsu
Global Health Trip 2014 - Quito, Ecuador: by Anita Ganti

**Egypt**
Al Hadra in Alexandria-Egypt: by Marianne Armanious

**Guatemala**
Pop WuJ - Health Services and Medical Care Program - Guatemala: by Adam Rosh

**Ghana**
University Hospital, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science & Technology - Ghana: by Desmond Brown
International Health Care Volunteers, Inc. (IHCV) - Ghana: by Jennifer Weidner
International Health Care Volunteers, Inc. (IHCV) - Ghana: by Mindy_Brittner
Current paid RFA membership list as of July 1, 2019

This is a good time to start your 2019 membership or pay for your 2020 Membership. At the same time think of supporting the RWJMS student Global Health Fellowship Fund (see information above).

David Alcid  
Gordon Benson  
Mary Breckenridge  
Edward Browning  
Barbara Calloway  
James Chandler  
David Egger  
Michael Gochfeld  
Ann Gordon  
Norma Greenfield

Murugesan Gounder  
Marsha Jessup  
Avedis Khachadurian  
Paula Krauser  
Lourdes Laraya-Cuasy  
Joseph Lieberman  
Michael Leibowitz  
Gordon Macdonald  
Paul Manowitz  
Steven Marcus

Virginia Mehlenbeck  
Sandra Moss  
Joyce Orenstein  
Robert Pinals  
Rob Risimini  
Phillip Schiffman  
Stephen Schneider  
Gordon Schochet  
Peter Scholz  
David Seiden

John L Semmlow  
Norman Sissman  
Frank Snope  
Paul Stein  
Marshall Swartzburg  
Mary Swigar  
Gisela Witz  
Harvey Waterman  
Judith Waterman

Retired Faculty Association

The annual dues period now corresponds to the calendar year. Dues are due now for calendar year 2019. (If your name is on the above list you can pay now for 2020).

RWJMS Retired Faculty Association 2019 (January 1, 2019 – December 31, 2019)

Benefits of RFA Membership:

- Defining, advocating for and publicizing the benefits of retired faculty at RWJMS,
- Fostering ongoing engagement and participation of retired faculty in RWJMS activities,
- Promoting continuing interaction among retirees,
- Providing information and options for faculty considering retirement, and
- Interacting with other academic retired faculty associations (e.g., The AAUP Emeriti Assembly of Rutgers University, The Rutgers Retired Faculty and Staff Association).

Please Print:

Name: ___________________________ Address: _______________________________
Phone: ____________________ E-mail address: ________________________________

-----------------------------------------------------------------

Please enclose a check for a donation to the Global Health Program and/or for dues ($15) made payable to the “RWJMS Retired Faculty Association,” and mail the check to Paul Lehrer, PhD, at the address shown below.

Global Health Program (indicate dollar amount) _____________ RFA DUES ($15 for 2019) _______

MAIL TO: Paul Lehrer, PhD  
Department of Psychiatry  
Rutgers Robert Wood Johnson Medical School  
671 Hoes Lane West, Piscataway, NJ 08854